



Scottish Jacobitism, Episcopacy, and Counter-Enlightenment

C.D.A. Leighton

To cite this article: C.D.A. Leighton (2009) Scottish Jacobitism, Episcopacy, and Counter-Enlightenment, *History of European Ideas*, 35:1, 1-10, DOI: [10.1016/j.histeuroideas.2008.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.histeuroideas.2008.06.003)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.histeuroideas.2008.06.003>



Published online: 03 Jan 2012.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 182



View related articles [↗](#)



Scottish Jacobitism, Episcopacy, and Counter-Enlightenment

C.D.A. Leighton*

History Department, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Available online 7 October 2008

Keywords:

Scottish Jacobitism
Scottish Episcopalianism
Counter-Enlightenment
Neo-Stoicism
Historical theology

ABSTRACT

Acknowledging the considerable degree of identity which developed between Episcopalianism and the Jacobite movement in Scotland, this study investigates the character of Episcopalian thought at the end of the seventeenth and in the first decade of the eighteenth century, making particular use of the writings of Bishop John Sage (1652–1711) and Principal Alexander Monro (d. 1698). It comments on the origins of that thought, with reference to both locally and temporally specific circumstances and the intellectual traditions of the seventeenth century, notably an increasing emphasis on historical method and the cultivation of neo-Stoicism. In commenting on the content of this thought, it centrally seeks to explain the relationship of the dominant theological theme of the writings examined to the intellectual, social and political threats to theocratic order offered by the period in general and the revolution of 1688–1689 in particular. It argues that it is chiefly in this way that Episcopalian Jacobite thought can be placed in the context of Enlightenment/Counter-Enlightenment debate.

© 2008 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

There has been little effort to investigate the Jacobite mind, certainly in Scotland, the epicentre of Jacobite disturbance. No doubt this lacuna might be attributed simply to Whiggery, of the kind practiced by reprobated historians. If it is, the researcher wishing to pursue the matter can take pleasure in noting that the study of the intellectual environment in which the Jacobites thought, which we can label as the early Enlightenment, has ceased to encourage teleology. Pre-occupation with and even acceptance of a canon of progressive Enlightenment writers has all but disappeared and celebratory accounts of the Enlightenment are as little in favour as such accounts of the 'Glorious Revolution.' Encouraged by rejection of its deconstructed content by others, historians have undermined the Enlightenment's utility as a concept. It has grown too large and amorphous. It appears as pervasive influences manifesting themselves in response to very varied historical circumstances and in their utilization in an immense range of debates. The thought developed in these debates can neither be understood nor evaluated without consideration of the entire range of contributions to them. These include those which reflected a conviction that those influences were mostly noxious.

All of this, if it be but possible to allow the use of the term by offering some definition of the Enlightenment, is conducive to the study of Jacobite thought. The present study is initially seeks to direct attention to debates which have hardly been thought necessary reading for the historian of the Scottish Enlightenment or, for that matter, the historian of Jacobitism. It suggests that what can now be designated as the denominational controversy between Episcopals and Presbyterians about ecclesiastical order in the late Stuart period is indeed highly relevant to investigators in both areas. It goes on to comment on the origins and character of the Episcopalian thought reflected in it. Such comment calls for attention to that "search for and triumph of self-interest" in the temporally specific and local circumstances of the elite groups concerned,

* Correspondence address: Bilkent Üniversitesi, İ.İ.S.B. Fak. (Tarih Bölümü), 06800 Bilkent, Ankara, Turkey. Tel.: +90 312 290 2208; fax: +90 312 290 2820.
E-mail address: Douglas@Bilkent.edu.tr.

from which Enlightenment – and Counter-Enlightenment – thought emerged.¹ It also calls for attention to those intellectual surroundings in which the debaters acquired their patterns of thought and ideas. The purpose of the concluding part of the study is to state the essential matter of the debate, which expresses a Counter-Enlightenment stance that could and did, politically, assume the form of Jacobitism. Such an assertion rests on the possibility of finding in the complexity and diversity of phenomena discussed under the rubrics of 'Enlightenment' and 'Counter-Enlightenment' a conceptual unity, albeit expressed in a variety of definitions, capable of being related to each other. Here, it is suggested that in seeking such unity the pre-eminently useful observation is that the period witnessed an extraordinarily widespread, multifaceted undermining of religious authority, both intellectual and institutional, in European culture – fully participated in by the clergy – rather than, as previously, mere struggles to exercise it.²

I

The failure of historians to offer an account of Jacobite thought is to be attributed less to Whiggery, than to modernity's faith in, and thus pre-occupation with politics. Such pre-occupation very misleadingly narrows what might be placed under the heading of 'Jacobite thought.' Thus, the able and perceptive scholar, Daniel Szechi, on setting out explicitly to remedy the neglect of the Jacobite mind, found only "scant resources" with which to do so, apparently because of an unwillingness to consider anything beyond the writings of men who were politically and militarily active in the Jacobite cause. A niche for such figures is unlikely to be easily found in the period's intellectual history and Szechi was thus no doubt wise to present his consideration of the ideas of George Lockhart within a merely biographical context.³ The frequently repeated point that the phenomenon of Jacobitism is not to be comprehended by study only of those who were prepared to risk a great deal by open adherence may be passed over. More interesting is Szechi's own observation, suggesting the inappropriateness of approaching Jacobitism with modern beliefs about the importance of politics, that "[i]n the early modern era only religion could justify killing and maiming one's neighbours, friends and kinsmen by the hundreds and thousands."⁴ It may well be that historians would do well to regard Jacobitism as a primarily religious phenomenon; but, in any case, the Jacobite mind, as Szechi makes clear, was a religious mind. Recent historiography has not been unwilling to acknowledge this, particularly in the emphasis that has been placed on the role of Episcopalianism in the story of Scottish Jacobitism.⁵ However, the consequent obligation to explore the character of the religion of the Scottish Non-Jurors has been little attended to,⁶ perhaps, in some measure, because it is thought to be well enough known from writings on the beliefs of other Non-Jurors. To speak of the relationship of the Non-Juring movement to politics, however, requires attention to the locally specific. Further, historians of the Church of England, in the past at least, have been less than anxious to advert to the interdependence of the religious and political beliefs of Non-Jurors. The former, they often shared and held to be perennially valuable; the latter, they had no interest in defending and treatment of them was, at best, likely to distract from the religious lessons of contemporary relevance which their history writing sought to offer.⁷

Certainly, a notional distinction should be made between Non-Juror and Jacobite thought. The former was the product of, for the most part, clergymen, who had principled as well as prudential reasons for not engaging actively in political debate. Alexander Monro, ejected from his post as principal of the University of Edinburgh in the purge of 1689, suffered government harassment as a suspected Jacobite plotter. He triumphantly declared to a friend that when search was made of his papers nothing was or could have been "found in them that looked towards any affairs of the state." He was silent on politics, he indicated, since he had enemies, but also because, as a clergyman, they were a matter of peripheral concern to him.⁸ A general dependence of the Non-Juring clergy on the Jacobite gentry, who, if they were not often anti-clerical, were certainly unlikely to submit to clerical domination, ensured that the clergy stayed within their proper sphere. Nevertheless, the Jacobite laity of Scotland and beyond held their political convictions as part of a complex of beliefs, like that of George Lockhart, held together and permeated by the teachings of their Non-Juring – or Catholic – clergy.⁹

¹ James T. Dennison, Jr., "The Twilight of Scholasticism: Francis Turretin at the Dawn of the Enlightenment," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman, R. Scott Clark (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999), 247.

² The acceptability of such a definition is probably best argued by showing its relationship to others. See, for example, Justin Champion's reference to a conventional characterization of the Enlightenment in the historiography of philosophy, speaking of epistemology, to his own concern with debates 'about who or what institution held the authoritative interpretation of truth' in his *Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660–1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), 10. Reference will be made below to further definitions of the Enlightenment.

³ Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1681–1731: A Study in Jacobitism* (East Linton, E. Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2002). See especially pp. 3 and 160.

⁴ Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 2006), 28.

⁵ With reference to Scottish historiography, reference must first be made to Bruce Lenman's, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain 1689–1746*, 2nd edn (Dalkeith, Midlothian: Scottish Cultural Press, 1995).

⁶ Murray G.A. Pittcock's, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1995) states the importance of Episcopalianism in understanding Jacobitism very forcefully in its second chapter; but then proceeds not to discussion not of the religious dimension of Jacobitism, but to its relationship to national sentiment.

⁷ C.D.A. Leighton, "The Non-Jurors and their History," *Journal of Religious History*, vol. 29, no. 3 (October 2005), 241–57, at 242–44.

⁸ Alexander Monro to John Mackenzie, 25 February and 16 March 1693, "Letters to John Mackenzie of Delvine from Rev. Alexander Monro, D.D., 1690–1698," ed. William Kirk Dickson, in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, vol. 5, Publications of the Scottish History Society, 3rd ser., vol. 21 (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1933), 242–46.

⁹ Szechi, *Lockhart*, 173–77, 198–202 and 274. See also, Lenman, *Jacobite Risings*, 55–67.

In brief, it might now be easily conceded that Episcopalian religion is deserving of some place in the intellectual history of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Scotland and that it possesses importance for an understanding of political and military history. In contrast to the now developing treatment of the content and influence of the ideas of both the Presbyterian and Episcopalian parties of the period before 1689, consideration of the Episcopalian mind after that date, in so far as it may enlighten either the intellectual or political historian, has been remarkably slight.¹⁰ We are indeed far from being able to offer any summary understanding gained from study of early Episcopalian belief and practice in general. Such lack of study accounts for the plainly improbable assertion of an historian as good as W.R. that the “distinctive religious position” of Episcopal Scotland could be identified with that of the ‘mystics of the North-East,’ discussed by George Henderson.¹¹ As to the political implications of the religious position of Episcopalians, Bruce Lenman advances the view that “[t]heir political militancy was rooted in a struggle for a sacramental view of life,” which extended to “a quasi-sacramental view of authority” and which can, he suggests, be illustrated in manifestations of belief in the immanence of the supernatural.¹² The thought is shared by Murray Pittock, who speaks of the belief in “a caesaro-sacramentalist monarchy,” albeit that he suggests that enthusiasm for it was due to English influence.¹³ This indeed contributes to an understanding of the religious character of Jacobitism, perceptively drawing attention to important and pervasive elements in the religion of eighteenth-century Scottish Episcopalians. However, they are readily identifiable as manifestations of a much wider phenomenon in the history of British Protestantism¹⁴ and, indeed, of a mindset rarely difficult to detect in early modern Europe. The observation fails to bring us close to Episcopalianism in its specificity as a Scottish phenomenon of the late Stuart and early Hanoverian periods.

Nor, it may be added, does it give useful guidance in the reading of the generality of the texts it has left us. Jacobite religious thought is not elusive: it was learnedly articulated, recorded, and published – to speak of the early decades of Jacobite history – in defences of episcopacy by, such as Bishop John Sage¹⁵ and Principal Monro.¹⁶ The reading of their works, which has formed the basis of the present essay, certainly gives no immediate impression of pre-occupation with themes which might be suggested by the comments of Lenman and Pittock. However, consisting, as they so often do, of discussion of topics in historical theology, they seem, at least at first, equally unhelpful in seeking early Episcopalianism’s local and temporal specificity. Still, the history of religious thought may certainly be treated in a national context, even if it requires the frequent taking of a wider view. It is conceded that the thought of Scottish Non-Jurors discussed here presented themes shared with their co-religionists elsewhere in the British Isles. Further, the intellectual traditions which they deployed in treating them were not singularly Scottish. Yet the thought of Scots was shaped by Scottish circumstances and articulated to address these. The concern to advance or resist the restoration of episcopal government of the Kirk – a concern that seems almost exclusive in the writings of churchmen in the period when the union of Episcopalianism and Jacobitism was formed – very obviously, in its dominance, comments on the nation’s contemporary ecclesiastical politics. Such pre-occupation with the recent triumph of a deprecated church order, discussed learnedly with respect to the fundamental principles of Christian authority, gave the literature spoken of here a more decidedly political focus than that encountered in other Non-Juror writings. If the Scottish Non-Jurors had a similar abhorrence of human usurpation of divine rights over the law of the realm to those of their communion in England, the misfortunes this had brought them were a spur to a greater degree of reflection on it.

The apologists for episcopacy pre-occupied themselves with the question of ecclesiastical authority; but they held that all authority, ecclesiastical and civil, was fundamentally one. Not that they were singular in possessing such a unified vision: ecclesiastical and civil authority were generally assumed to have a common character. Presbyterian Whigs and Episcopalian Jacobites differed only about the composition of that character. It would hardly be possible to treat as adventitious the similarity found in the writings of the zealous mid-century Whig, George Logan, between his Buchananite understanding of monarchical government, when the Jacobite scholar, Thomas Ruddiman, was his opponent, and his understanding of ministerial authority in the Kirk. Against the opponents of patronage, he asserted that such authority was received by ministerial succession, regulated by enquiry into the candidate’s life and doctrine, and preserved from any substantial popular influence. The same biblical topics were likely to appear in both debates.¹⁷ Like Logan, some Episcopalians might

¹⁰ The names of the parties contending over ecclesiastical government within the Kirk in the era before 1689 have been capitalized here – contrary to a commendable usage intended to emphasize that these parties were not predestined to develop into distinct ecclesial communities – since the present study concerns a period when such a separation had occurred or comments on the origins of this development.

¹¹ William R. Ward, “Anglicanism and Assimilation: or Mysticism and Mayhem in the Eighteenth Century,” in *Crown and Mitre: Religion and Society in Northern Europe since the Reformation*, ed. William M. Jacob, Nigel Yates (Woodbridge, Suff.: Boydell Press, 1993), 85–7. See also Henderson’s *Mystics of the North-East*, Publications of the Third Spalding Club, vol. 4 (Aberdeen: Third Spalding Club, 1934).

¹² Bruce Lenman, “The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,” in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689–1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982), 36–48. See especially pp. 42–3 and 46–7.

¹³ Pittock, *Myth*, 99.

¹⁴ Geoffrey Rowell places this sacramentalism in a broader temporal and theological context in his “‘Church Principles’ and ‘Protestant Kempism’: Some Theological Forerunners of the Tractarians,” in *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement*, ed. Paul Vais (Leominster, Heref.: Fowler Wright Books, 1996), 17–59.

¹⁵ The most substantial account of Sage, whose progress to a chair of divinity in St. Andrews was halted in 1688 and who was ordained to the episcopate in 1705, is a memoir written shortly after his death by Bishop John Gillan, *The Life of . . . John Sage: Wherein also Some Account is Given of his Writings, both Printed and in Manuscript*. . . (London: Henry Clements, 1714).

¹⁶ A short account of Monro, who, but for the Revolution, would have been the bishop of Argyll, but instead found himself ejected from the principalship of the University of Edinburgh, is prefixed to the edition of his correspondence with John Mackenzie, cited above, note 8.

¹⁷ cf. Logan’s *The Doctrine of the Jure-divino-ship of Hereditary Indefeasible Monarchy Enquired into and Exploded*. . . (Edinburgh: Thomas Lumsden, 1749) (see esp. pp. 52–8) and his *Modest and Humble Inquiry concerning the Right and Power of Electing and Calling Ministers to Vacant Churches* (Edinburgh: Gavin Hamilton, 1732). See esp. pp. 44–5.

have had serious doubts about arguments from the sources of civil authority to those of ecclesiastical authority;¹⁸ but others accepted the practice¹⁹ and the reverse went unquestioned. The Episcopalian divine's duty to guard against Presbyterian principles and practices in the life of the church was paramount; but the same principles, as Monro asserted, were "not only inconsistent with the monarchy, but even destructive of all human society."²⁰ The Episcopalian case was required to show that Presbyterianism essentially, and not merely in its more extreme manifestations, threatened, by virtue of its indulgence of popular influence, belief in an order – ecclesiastical and civil – created in the Covenant between God and humankind that constituted Christianity.²¹

In view of the near universality of such a theocratic presupposition, the Episcopalian writers could enjoy the relative safety of stating their case in an ecclesiological form, without elaborating on its obvious implications for the monarchy and laymen who exercised authority under it. Rather than denouncing human violation of the law of royal succession, they were content to develop a less contentious, if equally vital, assertion of theocracy, in an attack on the threat they perceived to come from Presbyterianism to the *jure divino* authority of the clergy to teach and rule their people. If this was of the most immediate concern to the clergy themselves, it was not unimportant to others. Clerical authority, it may be said after all, was as important as civil authority, throughout pre-modern Europe, for the preservation of an ordered, civilized society. The explicit content of the literature considered here, its treatment of the topic of clerical authority, should not be overlooked. It drew the clergy to Jacobite commitment and, moreover, united Jacobite argument to emerging Counter-Enlightenment discourse.

As hopes were dashed for a modification of the Revolution's religious settlement, more agreeable to the excluded clergy, an increased inclination to Jacobitism was inevitable; but the motivation was not merely self concern. Increasingly, the restoration of the Stuart dynasty was for many – and not only among the clergy – a means to achieve quite specific religious ends, which could only, as the matter was perceived, be accomplished mediately by a restoration of clerical authority. In English ecclesiastical history, the failure to achieve a second Restoration may well be said to have spread the conviction that "the church would be saved by private enterprise or not at all" and thus to have contributed to the most vital religious movements of the eighteenth century.²² The assertion of clerical authority was conducted on different levels and Scottish Episcopalians did not neglect what they understood to be the most fundamental. Monro lamented the wretched state of the clergy of both Catholic and Protestant Christendom, who were now "in their lowest ebb of interest and reputation." The cause lay simply in the universal assault on religion conducted under a slogan of opposition to "priestcraft," generated by "a boundless scepticism." He stated the consequence, echoing his warnings against Presbyterianism's threat to society – "human nature itself, commonsense, and civility are banished."²³

Presbyterians possessed much the same anxieties. The Presbyterian/Episcopalian debate, as we view it, often appears to spring from varying assessments of what constituted the greatest threats that the malaise of the age produced. Presbyterians attacked and Episcopalians stood on the defensive when Erastianism was feared and they were called upon to assert that they upheld "the intrinsic power of the church, as much as the Presbyterians;"²⁴ when they were accused of a uniform Arminianism²⁵ – the beginning of the path that declined to Arianism, Socinianism, and Deism; and even associated with the Latitudinarians, who had "so widened heaven's gates, that even heathens who know not Christ, may enter in."²⁶ Hostile responses to the threat perceived in the early Enlightenment – delineable Scottish Counter-Enlightenment stances – were integral parts of the cases developed by both sides in an old conflict. That developed by the Episcopalians found the union of what they assailed in Presbyterianism government's susceptibility to popular influence, creating a breach for the entrance of private judgment to corrupt a revealed faith, and a revolutionary threat to the order which was created by divine law and to be preserved by the Stuarts. How, both by virtue of external circumstances and by virtue of their habits of thought, this stance came into being and how it was expressed is the concern of the remaining parts of this essay.

II

Recent studies of Scottish religion in the era of the Restoration have directed attention to the influential presence of tendencies towards religious moderation, conducive to civil harmony. They are seen to have been reinforced by growing

¹⁸ See, for example, a copy of queries addressed to Henry Dodwell by Hon. Archibald Campbell, n.d., National Archives of Scotland [NAS], Episcopal Chest, CH 12/12/309, p. x.

¹⁹ See, for example, a reply to Henry Dodwell's "Case in View: Now in Fact. . ." by John Sage?, 1711?, NAS, Episcopal Chest, CH 12/12/235, pp. 1–18.

²⁰ Alexander Monro, *A Letter to a Friend*. . . (London: Joseph Hindmarsh, 1692), 5.

²¹ Szechi finds it remarkable that George Lockhart possessed a perception of the Scots as a covenanted people and suggests that this was singular, "a relic from his early years of enforced presbyterian education." See Szechi, *Lockhart*, 200–01. In fact, Covenant theology, albeit unrelated to national identity, was extremely important to Non-Jurors in general, especially in their sacramentology. See, for example, *The Theological Works of the Rev. Charles Leslie*, 7 vols. (Oxford: University Press, 1832), i, 181–3 and an application of such thought in Henry Dodwell to James Gadderar, 27 April 1704, NAS, Episcopal Chest, CH 12/12/1076.

²² See, for example, the remarks of Ward in "Anglicanism and Assimilation," 89.

²³ Alexander Monro, *A Letter to the Honourable Sir Robert Howard*. . . (London: E. Whitlock, 1696), 16–8.

²⁴ John Sage, *Some Remarks on the Late "Letter from a Gentleman in the City, to a Minister in the Country" and Mr. Williamson's Sermon. . . in a Letter*. . . (n.p., 1703), 5.

²⁵ John Sage, *The Reasonableness of a Toleration, Enquired into*. . . (London: n.p., 1705), 3–4.

²⁶ Gilbert Rule, *A Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland*. . . (Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1691), unpaginated preface, section 4.

acquaintance with intellectual phenomena, originating outside of Scotland, which can be classified as parts of the early Enlightenment.²⁷ Clare Jackson is inclined to see the Enlightened eirenicism of the period as a response to the “increasingly sceptical and irreligious attitudes among members of the lay political elite,” fostered by the religious conflict of the previous period.²⁸ In this view, Scotland is made to exemplify the traditional depiction of an Enlightenment nourished by reaction to bloody and inconclusive religious warfare or, at least, which constituted a passage from it. This is a view not to be entirely slighted, if only because it continues to find distinguished articulators. J.G.A. Pocock, for example, elects to depict the Enlightenment as a just, merely defensive war against the threat of disruption that religion offered to civil society, waged with the lesser aim of checking the simultaneous threat of a hegemonic monarchy.²⁹ The apologetic character of this depiction, drawing attention to motivations and ends presumed to be moral, might be disregarded. In that case, it does little more than restate the understanding of the Enlightenment offered here, as an assault upon religious authority. Some in the age, as they reflected on the recent past, did indeed welcome an assault on religion, though not their own. Most were much more inclined to attribute the civil disturbance they had witnessed to the erroneous beliefs and malignancy of their opponents than to religion in general. In any case, in Scotland, the enduring reversal of the fortunes of the religious parties under the new Williamite regime ensured a recrudescence of old conflict and, certainly on the losing side,³⁰ a reversal of any tendency to an Enlightened eirenicism.

That this reversal was not sudden may be attributed to a perception of a continuing fluidity in Scotland's ecclesiastical affairs. There might be an early restoration, involving a new settlement. If this were not to be, King William might determine to modify the existing settlement. Perhaps this would permit an accommodation of the expelled clergy in a comprehensive church. What was desired, after all, was a return to the church of the Restoration era, which was marked by its “partial integration of Presbyterianism and episcopacy.”³¹ In 1692 Monro spoke of his hopes for a “syncretism intended between the Presbyterians and the Episcopal clergy.” Later in the year he was considering if he was capable of making the compromises necessary to return from his English exile and accept the parish of Meigle, under the patronage of the earl of Strathmore.³² The transforming of the Presbyterian/Episcopalian division from a conflict of parties in the Church of Scotland to a conflict of confessions, becoming part of political and military conflict, took some time. The rabbling of the clergy in the south-west in the winter of 1688–1689 had already been a profoundly disturbing experience. The rhetoric used to describe it combined an appeal to the perennial fear with which *ancien régime* elites everywhere looked upon ‘that many headed beast’ to be found in the populace with an evocation of the cults of the martyrs, both in the cause of Stuart loyalism or that of Protestantism. That this jacquerie not only went unpunished, but also heralded the triumph of the party which at least tolerated it, in turn allowing the ouster of more ministers, created a deep alienation from government, increased by time.³³ It was with incredulity, recorded by Sage in 1695³⁴ that the dispossessed observed the continuing survival – at least in its existing form – of the new Presbyterian establishment, which had been created in this way. The manner in which these events were perceived, by Scottish ministers “with their distinctive cult of persecution and ... devoted to a culture of discipline as a means to a more orderly society,”³⁵ evokes understanding of the sentiments expressed in the descriptions they gave of them. The absence of more extreme physical violence should not allow us to underestimate their feelings of outrage: humiliation, particularly of members of an elite, could and did constitute atrocity.³⁶ The Episcopalian clergy's memory of affliction – and, in their strongholds north of the Tay, continuing anxiety – existed with an affliction shared by other Scots, who had cause to believe in the presence of the horsemen of the apocalypse among them in King William's ill years and cause to entertain political grievances as they moved into the new century.³⁷ An understanding that a willingness to accept an accommodation in the religious conflict was otiose, supported by a desperation they shared with the society around them, inevitably produced a disposition to uncompromising and radical stances.

Thus, two positions intended to deal with religious conflict, both readily identified with an Enlightened approach to religion, comprehension and the less satisfactory option of toleration, were rejected. Soon after the rabbling in the south-west, Sage was happy to speak, if, no doubt, for the purpose of elaborating on the enormity perpetrated, of the unity of faith and practice among those of Presbyterian and those of Episcopalian persuasion, which had generally prevailed, until after the death of King Charles. He asserted that, apart from the variance of opinion about ecclesiastical government and a few minor

²⁷ See, notably, Roger L. Emerson, “Scottish Cultural Change 1660–1710 and the Union of 1707” and Colin Kidd, “Religious Realignment between the Restoration and the Union,” in *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the Union of 1707*, ed. John Robertson (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), 121–44 and 145–68, respectively.

²⁸ Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660–1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge, Suff.: Boydell Press, 2003), 164.

²⁹ J.G.A. Pocock, *The Enlightenment of Edward Gibbon, 1737–1764*, vol. 1 of *Barbarism and Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999), 7.

³⁰ Colin Kidd observes that among Presbyterians ‘an apologetic revisionist historiography prevailed which sanitized the presbyterian past for the benefit of an English-dominated Revolution establishment ill-disposed to the excesses of the Covenanting tradition.’ *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689 - c. 1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), 51.

³¹ Walter Roland Foster, *Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland 1661–1688* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), unpaginated “Author's Note.”

³² Monro to Mackenzie, 16 January [16]92, 5 July 1692 and 23 August 1692, “Letters,” ed. Dickson, 223–26, 228–29 and 233.

³³ Thomas Morer, John Sage, Alexander Monro, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland in Several Letters* (London: S. Cook, 1690). See especially the unpaginated introductory address.

³⁴ *The Works of the Right Rev. John Sage ...*, ed. Charles F. Shand, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: for the Spottiswoode Society, 1844–1846), i, 1–2.

³⁵ Margo Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 2002), 7.

³⁶ *Age of Atrocity: Violence and Political Conflict in Early Modern Ireland*, ed. David Edwards, Pádraig Lenihan, Clodagh Tait (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), 20.

³⁷ Szechi, 1715, 13–14.

liturgical matters, there was “no imaginable difference between them and us.”³⁸ Comprehension could clearly work and had only been overthrown by Presbyterian zealotry. In the opening years of the eighteenth century, after the accession of Queen Anne, Sage was taking part in a debate about toleration—for Episcopalians. In truth, Sage feared to see such a measure enacted or even formally requested by any Episcopalians, as the recognition of Anne as *de facto* ruler involved was morally repugnant to him and would have created a schism.³⁹ Still, the opposition to a toleration articulated by George Meldrum, the moderator of the General Assembly in 1698 and 1703, gave Sage an opportunity to rehearse anti-Presbyterian views, chiefly for the benefit of English readers. Now there were indeed liturgical and doctrinal differences that justified a breach of communion. Among the latter, there was an understanding of the Church, which was depicted as inherent in Presbyterianism.⁴⁰ The tract reveals a good deal of the development of Episcopalian thought, which had now removed much common ground for debate. Sage had already, in his *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, published in 1695, indicated an unwillingness to be bound by the positions of the Scottish Reformers.⁴¹ He made clear now his unwillingness to be bound by seventeenth-century precedents, such as those afforded by the Kirk of the Restoration era. To allow such precedents was to be guilty of making “practice the standard of principle.” And principles could be ascertained with certainty, as “so apparently founded on scripture and reason; and so universally received by the Catholic Church for so many ages.”⁴² A cast of mind which once allowed comprehension was replaced by a disposition to confrontation. Nor were the political implications of such thinking shunned. The prefaced address to English readers made it clear to them that the danger offered to the establishment in other parts of the British Isles by Presbyterianism was such that its adherents could not be safely tolerated.

The experience of Scottish Episcopalians in the period that followed the Dutch invasion of Britain and the perception of Presbyterianism they developed convinced them that the conflicts of mid-century could not – by virtue of the continuing malignancy of their enemies – be left behind. Indeed, observing the course of events in Scotland, other Non-Jurors reached the same conviction.⁴³ However, the minds which were brought to the task of renewing the confidence of the faithful sons of the church in the rightness of the principles they were to defend, albeit that the subject matter they considered was often that of old controversy, were formed not in the Jacobean and Caroline church, but in the era of the Restoration. They had absorbed the commonplace views of the time, as well as some of those patterns of its thought which needed to be more studiously acquired. If the Episcopalian divines of the period are rightly seen to have constructed a Counter-Enlightenment position, it was their intention of defending religious authority and their growing intransigence in performing that task that made it so, rather than the materials they used. Arguments were formed from what came to hand. Thus, for example, Sage made it plain, in calling to the slumbering English, that the need to act against Presbyterians was occasioned by the obligation to defend religious truth; but his explicit justification of persecution, as he spoke of the conduct of Charles II's Scottish government, rested on grounds that might have been approved by Locke. The Presbyterians constituted a danger to civil peace, by virtue of their “seditious and ungovernable tempers,” inducing “open rebellions.”⁴⁴

The utilization among the Scottish Non-Juring clergy of trends of thought which might be claimed as harbingers of Enlightenment, but nevertheless served in the task of supporting religious authority, can be again exemplified in the case of Robert Kirk. This celebrated the minister of Aberfoyle is probably best remembered as a translator of the Psalms into Gaelic. His scholarly elaboration of his belief in the fairy world provided Lenman with illustration of Episcopalian appreciation of the immanence of the supernatural.⁴⁵ However, when the matter is further investigated, what is shown by this work of Kirk is rather enthusiastic participation in trends towards emphasis on the experimental and the experiential in investigation of the world and its inhabitants. Michael Hunter makes clear that the context for the understanding of Kirk's famous text is the interest in second sight among luminaries of the Royal Society, such as Robert Boyle and Edward Stillingfleet, with both of whom Kirk was acquainted.⁴⁶ The last of his surviving notebooks, in which he recorded something of his reading and reflection, suggests a cast of mind both zealously religious and rationalistic, in a manner perhaps most familiar to us from acquaintance with the Cambridge Platonists. His interest in natural philosophy – he was a reader of Sir Kenelm Digby – was occasioned by the conviction that concepts and practices relating to the supernatural realm required the support of both scriptural revelation and “solid reason” to prevent them meriting classification as, or degenerating into, “uncertain fancies” and superstitions. The outcome of such degeneration was infidelity and defence against infidelity was the final cause of his activity.⁴⁷

Sage's choice of argument and Kirk's intellectual environment are to be noted; but neither suggests placing such men in an ambiguous position in Enlightenment/Counter-Enlightenment debate. Rhetoric and methodologies should be

³⁸ Morer et al., *Present Persecution*, 10.

³⁹ John Sage to David Drummond?, 21 December 1702, NAS, Episcopal Chest, CH 12/12/1974. See also Sage to Archibald Campbell, 15 February 1711, CH12/12/1981, where Sage offers further objections to a formal toleration of Episcopalians.

⁴⁰ Sage, *Reasonableness of a Toleration*. The points are given briefly in the first of the letters that constitute the volume (see pp. 1–7) and elaborated throughout the work.

⁴¹ Sage, *Works*, i. 337–346.

⁴² Sage, *Reasonableness of a Toleration*, 15–17.

⁴³ See, for example, Charles Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus*... (Edinburgh: n.p., 1695) or his *New Association of those Called Moderate Churchmen, with the Modern Whigs and Fanatics*... 3rd edn (London: n.p., 1702). See especially, 2nd pagination, pp. 1–3.

⁴⁴ Morer et al., *Present Persecution*, 49.

⁴⁵ See above, p. 3.

⁴⁶ Michael Hunter, *The Occult Laboratory: Magic, Science and Second Sight in Late Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Woodbridge, Suff.: Boydell Press, 2001), 12–21 and 77–117.

⁴⁷ Robert Kirk, “An Account of Some Occasional Meditations... Begun 9 August 1681,” Edinburgh University Library, La. III.529, pp. 55–61.

distinguished from the purposes they serve. They do, though, often undermine them. Thus it was with, for example, the attempted defence of Anglicanism in the formation of a 'holy alliance' with the Newtonian form of the new science.⁴⁸ It was not the thought of its adherents that made Scottish Episcopalianism immune from such mutation. If it was preserved from "modernistic moderatism" as one of the "remnant pockets of fundamental orthodoxy,"⁴⁹ that must be attributed to its situation of involuntary exclusion, which relieved it of an establishment's necessity of a disposition to comprehensiveness and laid on it no demands to accommodate itself to surrounding circumstances. An authority not actually exercised could be defended without compromise. The importance attributed to that defence and the scholarly form it took are to be considered next.

III

The Scottish Episcopalian writers of the early Jacobite period were concerned, centrally and pervasively, to present an argument on the subject of schism. This should be unfolded to display its significance as a manifestation of theocratic belief supportive of Jacobitism. The present paper also identifies as most notable two elements in later seventeenth-century thought, both accepted as of considerable importance, which shaped the form this central argument took. One may be described as the extension into the areas of divinity and historiography of Barbara Shapiro's 'culture of fact.'⁵⁰ Non-Jurors were among the foremost exponents of an historical method in theology, which they found of pastoral value in an environment highly receptive of arguments based on 'matters of fact' and of controversial value in its ability to allow a substantial rejection, on epistemological grounds, of the early Enlightenment's practice of natural theology, whether by Deists, the christologically heterodox or Latitudinarians. The truth of the Christian revelation and the correct interpretation of it were to be vindicated with factual, historical demonstration from scripture and – though this was argued cautiously – similarly inspired patristic writings, respectively. No other practice was possible. In view of the inadequacy of human language, derived from merely human experience, the natural theologians spoke of matters they could know not of. Only the language of the revelation in scripture, interpreted historically with reference to Greek philosophy and patristic thought, could speak of matters relating to the divine.⁵¹

The other element in the Jacobite intellectual heritage spoken of here, its Neo-Stoicism, has been very well described in its Scottish particularities, though not extensively explored, by David Allan. The Neo-Stoicism of Scottish Jacobites may be seen as an aspect of that cultivation of the classics that has been recognized as characteristic of them.⁵² Indeed, Jacobitism as a whole was associated with the maintenance of an older literary and scholarly culture⁵³ and this may be regarded as a Counter-Enlightenment trait, if by no means a distinguishing one. For much is understood of the Enlightenment, certainly in the British Isles, if it is perceived as a vulgarization of culture, occasioned by the demands of a greatly expanding publishing trade, feeding on controversy and iconoclasm.⁵⁴ Still, Scottish Jacobites were rather different, not merely by virtue of the strength of their country's tradition of Latinity, but also because the elitist character of this tradition served well to assert their ideological identity against and superiority to Presbyterian Whigs, whose crypto-democratic character they were committed to exposing. The disposition to such assertion was frequently manifested by the early clerical Jacobites, in whom the presence of such learning served well in denigrating their rivals, drawing attention to those who had "been . . . trained up in mechanic employments, and have now leapt directly from the shop into the pulpit."⁵⁵

For all Non-Jurors, whether in Scotland or in other parts of the British Isles, the matter of schism was central to the articulation of their position and for all schism was identified in a negation of episcopal authority. The regnant church in England could be deemed schismatic by virtue of its acquiescence in the Williamite deprivation of Archbishop Sancroft and his eight episcopal brethren. Yet, a late seventeenth-century auditory was habituated to a juxtaposing of 'schismatic' and 'Presbyterian' and might be apt to think the schismatic might be simply identified as such by a lack of social approbation. The charge of schism against the regnant church thus possessed a popular credibility in Scotland and accordingly occupied a more prominent place in discussion there, where beliefs about social approbation of the new establishment and its unquestionably well-supported rival were much contested. Episcopalians were inclined to reassure themselves with a focus on "the people . . . northward" and the chief constituent parts of the nation, "the nobles and gentry"⁵⁶ and the "eminent

⁴⁸ John Gascoigne, *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment: Science, Religion and Politics from the Restoration to the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989), part 1.

⁴⁹ Dennison, "Twilight of Scholasticism," 247.

⁵⁰ Barbara J. Shapiro, *A Culture of Fact: England, 1550–1720* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 2000). See especially chapters 2 and 7.

⁵¹ C.D.A. Leighton, "Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: A Study of Henry Dodwell," *History of European Ideas* 31 (2005) 1–16, at 6–12 and Leighton, "Non-Jurors and their History," 246–57.

⁵² Colin Kidd, "The Ideological Significance of Scottish Jacobite Latinity," in *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain, 1660–1800*, ed. Jeremy Black, Jeremy Gregory (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1991), 110–30.

⁵³ For exemplification see J.C.D. Clark, *Samuel Johnson: Literature, Religion and English Cultural Politics from the Restoration to Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994) and Jonathan Clark, Howard Erskine-Hill (eds.), *Samuel Johnson in Historical Context* (Basingstoke, Hants.: Palgrave, 2002). See especially Clark's essay, "Religion and Political Identity: Samuel Johnson as a Nonjuror," 79–145 and David Money's "Samuel Johnson and the Neo-Latin Tradition," 199–221.

⁵⁴ Roy Porter, *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World* (London: Allen Lane, 2000), chapter 4.

⁵⁵ Monro, *Letter to a Friend*, 4.

⁵⁶ Morer et al., *Present Persecution*, 2.

divines” and “learned men of all other professions.”⁵⁷ Yet, in a matter of religious doctrine, general approval, whether by the vulgar or the nation, weighed not at all or, indeed, suggested falsity. Episcopalians made the point; but this was hardly contested when thus explicitly stated.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, in the particular matter of schism, Sage felt obliged to emphasize it.

Mahumetism is as much Mahumetism in Constantinople, as if it were in Edinburgh; Popery has as much civil law for it in Spain, as Presbytery has in Scotland. If Presbytery was a schism before the late revolution, civil authority can make it no better than a prosperous or prevailing schism.⁵⁹

The matter of whether or not the Kirk of Scotland was schismatic was to be adjudicated with reference not to legal, political or social circumstances, but to theological argument. The Christian revelation displayed schism as a moral evil, with at least two aspects: the sin of participation in visible schism was an outward manifestation of wilful ecclesiological heterodoxy.

Sage identified the heresy in question as that of “the Brownists and other English separatists.”⁶⁰ This was but to abuse his opponents. Indeed, Robert Browne himself was abused. He had been no true Brownist – a protagonist of freedom of religion and a principled enemy of religious establishment. Those, including John Goodwin, denounced by Samuel Rutherford as contenders “for lawless liberty, or licentious toleration of sects and heresies,” had, in fact, distanced themselves from Browne.⁶¹ But if self-confessed Brownism was hard to locate, this did not restrain other distinguished Presbyterian divines from striving to combat the error. Robert Baillie thundered against it as a “democratic anarchy,” which proclaimed “the divine right of the church, that is the parish, to elect, admit, depose, excommunicate their ministers and elders, of which right neither prince nor presbytery nor assembly can deprive them.”⁶² Sage ignored not only this stance among the Scottish divines, but that history of the era of the wars and Interregnum which disclosed their zeal to defend their declared ecclesiological stances against erstwhile English allies. His concern was not with what Presbyterians said or their sincerity in saying it, but to show the noxious consequences of principles he perceived as inherent in their religion – and remarkably similar to those of contemporary free-thinkers, whose hostility to the ordained order was unconcealed.

The divinity that he expounded, for which he was obliged to one of the most profound of the Non-Juror divines and his personal friend, Henry Dodwell,⁶³ had long noted the well-spring of the schismatic revolt against the order established by the divine will in church and state. It lay in what religious writers have been inclined to refer to as a claim to a right of private judgment, exercised in the interpretation of scripture. The belief that the scriptures might be expounded “only by [the scriptures] themselves,” had led those who adhered to it, in practice, to interpret them by their own “modern systems.”⁶⁴ In this way they were led

... into multitudes of error, into a contempt of authority, into a rejection of ecclesiastical constitutions prudently fitted to circumstances of present practice, into an impossibility of ecclesiastical peace, till all sorts of persons, laics as well as clergymen, may be agreed on which side the scripture is clear in many things whereof ... no account at all is to be expected in the scripture.⁶⁵

The antidote to this infection was to be found, in a social and political form, in a well-founded clerical authority supported by a similarly sanctioned monarchy and, in an intellectual form, in a sound exposition of the Christian revelation. This, in principle, rested on the method of the Caroline divines, who took “the scriptures for their rule; and the ancients and right reason for guides, for finding the genuine sense of that rule.”⁶⁶ The Presbyterians’ denunciation of schism was pointless, while they in fact undermined religious authority by rejecting its episcopal foundation, which upheld and was upheld by this salutary method of expounding doctrine. They might denounce schism; but it was their own beliefs that nurtured and sustained it. Sage’s formulation of the charge against Presbyterianism made clear the dimensions of the evil of schism. The exercise of unrestrained human judgment had overthrown the divinely instituted episcopal basis of clerical authority. Presbyterian clerical authority could rest on nothing else than a human sanction, that of a consensus to be held and executed by virtue of “the original power of the people,” precisely the sanction which had allowed the recent usurpation of the crown. It was vain for the Presbyterians to claim some other sanction. They had no desire to bring forth the alternatives offered by enthusiasts, claiming the possibility of an immediate divine commission, or by Erastians.⁶⁷ Thus, Sage’s task was merely to strip away the fig-leaf of the Presbyterians, which concealed their democratic shame – their claim that the source of

⁵⁷ Monro, *Letter to a Friend*, 4.

⁵⁸ Rule, *Second Vindication*, 72–3.

⁵⁹ Sage, *Reasonableness of a Toleration*, 6–7.

⁶⁰ Sage, *Reasonableness of a Toleration*, 98.

⁶¹ John Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford*, ed. pbk. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), 203. The quotation in the text is from the title of Rutherford’s famous *Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience* ... (London: Andrew Crook, 1649).

⁶² Quoted in Gordon Donaldson, *Scottish Church History* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985), 212.

⁶³ Sage did, of course, diverge from Dodwell, when the latter, towards the end of his life, found reason to resume communion with the regnant church. It is probably his opinions about this, rather than Bishop Rattray’s, which are recorded in NAS, Episcopal Chest, CH12/12/235. It is striking that the two died on the same day, 7th June, 1711.

⁶⁴ Henry Dodwell, *Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government ... Proved Schismatical* ... (London: Benj[amin] Tooke, 1679), xix.

⁶⁵ Henry Dodwell, *Separation from Episcopal Government*, xviii.

⁶⁶ Morer et al., *Present Persecution*, 44. For an understanding of what Sage speaks of here, see Iain M. MacKenzie, *God’s Order and Natural Law: The Works of the Laudian Divines* (Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate, 2002), chapter 2.

⁶⁷ Sage, *Reasonableness of a Toleration*, 10–4.

presbyteral authority lay in the presbyters themselves. Against this, it was to be demonstrated from revelation, at least, that such a source was inadequate in the absence of episcopal commission. The record of his attempt to provide this demonstration is chiefly in his major works, *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age* and its much longer *Vindication*.

It was Presbyterianism's adherence to schism that overwhelmingly directed Sage's attitude to it. He professed no general hostility to Calvinism (while opposing its enforcement in the form of the Westminster Confession), holding that Arminianism might well tend to encourage that christological heterodoxy, which was the chief expression of early Enlightenment rationalism.⁶⁸ It is pre-eminently his pre-occupation with combating schism which argues that Sage is to be placed as a writer of the Counter-Enlightenment. The identification of schism with the exercise of private judgment relates his work to the most conventional descriptions of the Enlightenment as essentially constituted by an increased emphasis, in a quest for certain knowledge, on the reasoning of the individual, as opposed to sources under ecclesiastical guardianship—divine revelation and communally possessed, historically accumulated knowledge. The theological method Sage employed against Presbyterian schism seems, in its historical rationalism, to give that work a more equivocal appearance. Yet the relationship of his historical method to the re-assertion of the role of revelation, spoken of above,⁶⁹ and the purpose it was made to serve substantially remove such an equivocal appearance.

Sage has been placed in estimation beside Thomas Rattray, “the great doctor” of the eighteenth-century Episcopalians, as his editor rightly called him. Sage was hardly, unlike his much younger contemporary, original in his divinity. Both were obliged to Henry Dodwell.⁷⁰ However, Sage followed Dodwell much more closely, both in the extent of his commitment to the historical method and also in his application of it. Their work reflected an increasing lack of faith in the Caroline trinity of scripture, reason and the Fathers, despite their formal declarations of loyalty to it. As the early Enlightenment's heterodoxy scored points by turning reason against scripture, historically excavated patristic resources were brought to its aid, in particular those of the western church in the third century, the Cyprianic Age. Professor Henry Cowan, a latter-day Presbyterian critic of the bishop's arguments, acknowledged that Sage had “amply proved” that his own understanding of episcopal authority was established “by the time of Cyprian.” Thus far did his historical method triumph. Sage's failure, Cowan went on to point out, lay in an inability to demonstrate that this understanding was shared by the apostolic church and thus constituted part of revelation.⁷¹ Sage was here reduced to weak *a priori* arguments, which did no more than suggest the improbability of change between the first and third centuries. The theology of the age allowed him only one alternative. He might have claimed for the tradition of the patristic age a near equality of authority with scripture. He came close to doing so in his claim “that the extraordinary manifestations and communications of the Divine Spirit had not . . . ceased” in the patristic age; but the point was left undeveloped and it was supplemented by a number of others he held to justify Dodwell's election of the Cyprianic age as perennially normative.⁷² If Sage did not proceed as far on the path of abandoning *sola scriptura* principles as other Non-Jurors were to do, particularly in the Usager debates,⁷³ this was not due merely to a fear of appearing to stand too close to the teachings of Trent on the matter of tradition. He was quite willing to declare that no infallibility could credibly be attributed even to the ecumenical councils of the early church.⁷⁴

Remaining fashionable among many in their day, Neo-Stoicism undoubtedly exercised very considerable influence among the Non-Jurors. The young Dodwell, for example, had begun his life-long task of setting out his understanding of Christianity with characteristically extended comments on the theological value of Stoic teachings, prefixed to a work of his old tutor.⁷⁵ Scottish Episcopalians were no exception. In the conflict with Presbytery, Neo-Stoic political thought seems to have guided Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh in beliefs relevant to his conduct in dealing with the Covenanters. His Stoic reflection on the value of withdrawal from public affairs – Sage seems to have sympathized with his views on this matter – were, together with the most familiar elements of the teachings of the Stoics, no doubt a comfort to him and others when darker days came after the Revolution.⁷⁶ But his continuing consideration too, in these last years of his life, of Stoic morality may not have been found irrelevant by those still much engaged in struggle. For the wilful profession of the ecclesiological error that was schism was generally the product of prior moral failure. For such as Sage and Monro, to whom Sir George was an “old and steadfast friend” and whose virtues as a Christian Stoic he eulogized,⁷⁷ it was Stoic terms which most readily assisted in shaping a treatment of this moral aspect of schism. An entry into the published texts of the sermons Monro had

⁶⁸ Gillan, *Sage*, 33–6. Monro, it may be noted, at least noticeably avoided any condemnation of Calvinist doctrinal shibboleths. See, for example, Alexander Monro, *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland*. . . (London: Joseph Hindmarsh, 1692), 51–2.

⁶⁹ See above, p. 7.

⁷⁰ *The Works of . . . Thomas Rattray, D.D. of Craighall* . . . , ed. George H. Forbes, Walter Bell, 2 vols. (Burntisland, Fife: Pitligo Press, 1854–1881). Even brief perusal of this will show a dependence on earlier Non-Juring divines, including Dodwell, whose work is used, however, in the able expression of an individual theological contribution.

⁷¹ Henry Cowan, “Bishop Sage and his Argument against Presbytery,” in *Christian Unity Association of Scotland, Historical Papers Submitted to the Christian Unity Association of Scotland* . . . 1911–1913 (n.p., 1914) 156–77, at 172.

⁷² Sage, *Works*, iii, 19–30.

⁷³ C.D.A. Leighton, “The Non-Jurors and the Counter-Enlightenment: Some Illustration,” *Journal of Religious History* 22, no. 3 (October 1998) 270–86, at 278–80.

⁷⁴ John Sage to Archibald Campbell or John Falconar, undated, NAS, Episcopal Chest, CH12/12/1986.

⁷⁵ John Stearne, *De obstinatione: opus posthumum, pietatem christiano-stoicam, scholastico more, suadens* . . . (Dublin: Benjamin Tooke, 1672). Examples of Stoic influence on Non-Jurors might easily be multiplied; but the present writer is unaware of an attempt to estimate and describe its role among them.

⁷⁶ David Allan, *Philosophy and Politics in Later Stuart Scotland: Neo-Stoicism, Culture and Ideology in an Age of Crisis, 1540–1690* (East Linton, E. Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2000), 92–3 and 190–205.

⁷⁷ Monro to Mackenzie, 24 and 31 March 1691, “Letters,” ed. Dickson, 215–16.

preached in Edinburgh immediately reveals a clear conviction that the “new philosophy” preached and practiced by the apostles had been clearly prefigured in the doctrines of the Stoa. He began his series of sermons by expatiating on the rationality that informed creation; moved on to discuss the “fleshly lusts” spoken of the first epistle of St. Peter, which now appeared as the Stoic passions; and in the third sermon there was much to commend withdrawal from “the labyrinths and intrigues of affairs.”⁷⁸

When Monro directed sustained attention to displaying the primitive Christian condemnation of the Presbyterian schism, in his *Enquiry into the New Opinions*, it was the matter of the passions and their control that directed his thought. He began with a clear identification of the Kirk’s doctrine of ministerial parity with a dolorously perceived early Enlightenment. In this doctrine it was again to be perceived “how triumphantly atheism and impiety lift up their banners everywhere.” For it was in the attempt to justify the gratification of the passions that the exercise of a pretended right of private judgment in matters of religion and the consequence of this, the further sin of schism, had their origins. The Presbyterian clergy constituted a manifestation of an historically observable, perennial source of corruption in the Church, a tendency in the clergy to deviate from its primary duty, to mortify the “lusts and passions” of the people and, in seeking to be “voted the most edifying” by them, become their mere “slaves.” The remedy, of course, was to be found in obedience to the divine authority transmitted from the apostles “by an orderly succession” – a return to authentic theocracy.⁷⁹ Sage had made much the same point. He had seen in the Claim of Right’s apparent willingness to allow “the inclination of the generality of the people” to become a standard of doctrine

...the fundamental principle of Hobbism... [of] making religion, reason, revelation ... yield unto, at least, depend on, the frisks of flesh and blood, or, which is all one, arrant sense and ungovernable passion.⁸⁰

If Non-Jurors and others of similar mind embraced an enthusiastic belief in the value of historical facts in conducting their defences of Christian orthodoxy, it is unsurprising. For this belief was an important part of the epistemological contribution to rebuilding authority in the British Isles in the years after 1660. However, it will hardly be claimed that they were the major beneficiaries of this Restoration inheritance. The Neo-Stoic tradition, which, though it placed “emphasis on the pursuit of stability and security,” had generally tended to produce a “conciliatory and relatively tolerant... disposition” in its Scottish adherents, scarcely appears at first sight the most likely instrument of thought for those engaged in the militant defence of Christian orthodoxy.⁸¹ In brief, reference to the building materials provides a very inadequate explanation of what was constructed. This is best contextualized as a Counter-Enlightenment response to the age’s assault on a theocratic order. More immediately, it was a response to the assault on the *jure divino* character of the Scottish monarchy made in 1689 – and the change in the ecclesiastical establishment that accompanied this. It is pre-occupation with these Scottish realities which does most to explain the structure created by the clerical writers spoken of here. Such pre-occupation, as they endured or feared persecution, is certainly understandable. It did, however, much diminish their capacity to speak effectively and enduringly about the more general matters that vexed them, as they looked beyond the bounds of Scotland. In retrospect, their assault on the evils of the age is seen to have been misdirected. After all, an episcopal ecclesiastical order did no more in England to combat the diminution of religious authority in the eighteenth century than presbytery did in Scotland. Moreover, what was identified as corruption in Presbyterianism, its indulgence of popular influence, proved – as the history of the Moderate and Popular parties of the succeeding period immediately shows⁸² – a defence of Christian orthodoxy against the ‘modernistic moderatism’ by which the Enlightened elites defended their power.

Yet, the Episcopalian case served Jacobitism well. After all, the Calvinist intellectual tradition was indeed hostile to that monarchical mode of asserting theocracy with which the British Isles was familiar in the Stuart period and Presbyterians did support what at least could be understood as the overthrow of it in 1689. The Episcopalian ideologues can now be faulted for their attempt to link Calvinist thought and action so unequivocally to the irreligion of their age; but it remains true that *their* theocracy had been grievously wounded – and that Presbyterians at least shared in the guilt. The Episcopalian clergy, their patrons, noblemen and lairds, and the professional elite of large swathes of the country, surveyed with profound anxiety the consequences of the overthrow of the Restoration regime: religious change which appeared to threaten the social order; domestic and foreign warfare, with the economic distress it brought; and natural disaster bringing a protracted subsistence crisis. The writings of their divines gave authoritative intellectual support to the conviction that such were the consequences of the most egregious manifestation of the age’s claim to replace the law given in the Christian revelation by law invented by fallen creatures to gratify their passions – their parliament’s hitherto successful attempt to depose a Stuart monarch.

⁷⁸ Alexander Monro, *Sermons Preached ... in ... St. Giles’s Church, Edinburgh* (London: Joseph Hindmarsh, 1693), 1–110. See especially pp. 37–8 and 77.

⁷⁹ Alexander Monro, *An Enquiry into the New Opinions (chiefly) Propagated by the Presbyterians of Scotland...* (London: Walter Kettilby, 1696), 5–7.

⁸⁰ Sage, *Works*, i, 336.

⁸¹ Allan, *Philosophy and Politics*, 12 and 121.

⁸² Ian D.L. Clark, “From protest to reaction: The Moderate regime in the Church of Scotland, 1752–1805,” in *Scotland in the Age of Improvement: Essays in Scottish History in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. N.T. Phillipson, Rosalind Mitchison, 2nd edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1996), 200–24.